UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/623,274	07/18/2003	Brian Gonsalves	1033-SS00378	2414

34456 7590 01/12/2006

TOLER & LARSON & ABEL L.L.P.
5000 PLAZA ON THE LAKE STE 265
AUSTIN, TX 78746

EXAMINER	
CHAI, LONGBIT	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2131	

DATE MAILED: 01/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/623,274	GONSALVES ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Longbit Chai	2131	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *19 December 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-30* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-30* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *18 July 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 – 30 are presently pending presented for examination.

Response to Pre-Appeal Brief Request

2. In response to Pre-Appeal Conference on request by Applicant for pre-appeal brief filed on 12/19/2005, a new ground of rejection has been made with the new reference of Shaffer et al. (U.S. Patent 6145083) to withdraw the finality of the rejection. See the following office section.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1 – 4, 6, 8, 9 – 14, 16, 17, 19 – 26 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen et al. (U.S. Patent 6477595), in view of Shaffer et al. (U.S. Patent 6145083).

As per claim 1, 10, 19, 23 and 26, Cohen teaches a system comprising:

a first interface to a local area network connection to an end-user computer (Cohen: Column 4 Line 58 – 64 and Figure 1 Element 119);

a second interface to a wide area network connection to a distributed computer network (Cohen: Column 4 Line 58 – 64 and Figure 1 Element 119);

detection logic responsive to the first interface, the detection logic to detect user inactivity at the end-user computer (Cohen: Column 10 Line 65 – Column 11 Line 3).

However, Cohen teaches, during the user inactivity period, the system enters a standby mode and releases the associated modem to the free pool (Cohen: Column 10 Line 65 – Column 11 Line 3). Cohen does not disclose expressly to disable communications received from the second interface from being sent over the first interface to the end-user computer.

Shaffer teaches disable communications received from the second interface from being sent over the first interface to the end-user computer – i.e., the standby mode (but with restricted communications) that may resume the communications originated from the WAN side only upon the authentication of user identities (Shaffer: Column 5 Line 31 – 32 & Cohen: Column 10 Line 65 – Column 11 Line 3).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Shaffer within the system of Cohen because (a) Cohen teaches providing the mechanism of modem management during the user inactivity period in a LAN-WAN networking environment (Cohen: Column 10 Line 65 – Column 11 Line 3), and (b) Shaffer teaches an enhanced network security

method, during the user inactivity period, to restrict the communications including the incoming data traffic originated from the WAN side via communication link unless the user authentication has been provided to resume the communications (Shaffer: Column 5 Line 18 – 32, Column 3 Line 46 – 51 and Column 2 Line 46 – 48).

Accordingly, Shaffer in view of Cohen teaches blocking logic responsive to the detection logic, the blocking logic to selectively initiate a blocking signal to disable communications received from the second interface from being sent over the first interface to the end-user computer (Cohen: Column 10 Line 65 – Column 11 Line 3 & Shaffer: Column 5 Line 18 – 32).

As per claim 2, Cohen as modified teaches the blocking logic sends the blocking signal in response to the detecting logic detecting the user inactivity for a selected period of time (Cohen: Column 10 Line 65 – Column 11 Line 3 & Shaffer: Column 5 Line 18 – 32).

As per claim 3 and 24, Cohen as modified teaches the selected period of time is between one and ten minutes (Cohen: see for example, Column 10 Line 65 – Column 11 Line 3 & Shaffer: Column 5 Line 18 – 32).

As per claim 4, 16 and 21, Cohen as modified teaches the selected period of time is a fixed time period (Cohen: Column 10 Line 65 – Column 11 Line 3).

As per claim 6 and 25, Cohen as modified teaches the detection logic and the blocking logic is embedded within an auto-sensing Ethernet port (Cohen: for example, Column 10 Line 65 – 67 & Shaffer: Column 5 Line 18 – 32: Examiner notes (a) "an auto-sensing Ethernet port" is interpreted as an Ethernet port (e.g. multiple-access collision detections) integrated with a CP modem as a complete functional entity to automatically facilitate the inactivity detection of the end-user computer (Cohen: Column 10 Line 65 – 67), and (b) the blocking logic should be integrated with the detection logic at the same physical device so that the communication overhead can thus be reduced to the minimum).

As per claim 8, Cohen as modified teaches the distributed computer network is the Internet (Cohen: see for example, Column 1 Line 32 – 40).

As per claim 9, Cohen as modified teaches the second interface is coupled to an internet service provider (Cohen: see for example, Column 1 Line 60 – 63).

As per claim 11, Cohen as modified teaches detecting activity from the end-user computer at the routing equipment (Cohen: see for example, Column 10 Line 65 – Column 11 Line 3).

As per claim 14 and 29, Cohen as modified teaches the first local data connection is an Ethernet connection (Cohen: see for example, Column 4 Line 58 – 64 and Figure 1 Element 119).

As per claim 17 and 22, Cohen as modified teaches the idle time activity threshold is a programmable threshold (Cohen: Column 10 Line 65 – 67).

As per claim 20 (& claim 12 and 13), Cohen as modified teaches during a second period of time after the first period of time, detecting activity at the first port of the digital subscriber line routing equipment indicating activity at the end-user computer and communicating data received at the second port of the digital subscriber line routing equipment to the first port of the digital subscriber line routing equipment and to the end-user computer (Shaffer: Column 7 Line 44 – 45 and Column 5 Line 28 – 32: resuming the user inactivity of the locked mode back to the activity detection of the normal mode upon the user authentication that would otherwise restrict the communications via the network link as taught by Shaffer).

4. Claims 5, 18 and 27 – 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen et al. (U.S. Patent 6477595), in view of Shaffer et al. (U.S. Patent 6145083), and in view of Evans (U.S. Patent 6807666).

As per claim 5 and 18, Cohen as modified teaches the selected period of time is TBD minutes, may be one minute (Cohen: Column 10 Line 65 – 67). However, Cohen does not disclose expressly is determined by a user of the end-user compute.

Evans teaches the selected period of time is determined by a user of the end-user computer (Evans: Column 5 Line 29 – 32).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Evans within the system of Cohen as modified because Evans teaches provides improved methods and arrangements for use in multiple user computing environments, which can be configured to allow for a plurality of separate and concurrent desktops and workspaces within the shared computing environment (Evans: Column 1 Line 60 – 64).

As per claim 27 and 28, Cohen as modified does not disclose expressly detecting resumed activity from at least one of more of the plurality of end-user computers previously in an inactive state.

Evans teaches detecting resumed activity from at least one of more of the plurality of end-user computers previously in an inactive state (Evans: Column 5 Line 25 – 28). See the same rationale of combination as addressed above in rejecting claim 5.

5. Claims 7, 15 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen et al. (U.S. Patent 6477595), in view of Shaffer et al. (U.S. Patent 6145083), and in view of Gerszberg (U.S. Patent US 6510152 B1).

As per claim 7, 15 and 30, Cohen as modified teaches using point to point protocol. However, Cohen does not disclose expressly the wide area network is a digital subscriber line connection that carries authenticated point to point protocol over Ethernet session traffic.

Gerszberg teaches the wide area network is a digital subscriber line connection that carries authenticated point to point protocol over Ethernet session traffic (Gerszberg: Column 21 Line 38 – 42 and Column 19 Line 24 – 29).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Gerszberg within the system of Cohen as modified because Gerszberg teaches an improved network such as Ethernet transported over DSL modems by providing higher bandwidth, improving the CPE capabilities and lowering overall system costs to the customer (Gerszberg: Column 1 Line 27 – 30 and Column 2 Line 40 – 43).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Longbit Chai whose telephone number is 571-272-3788. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00am-4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz R. Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Longbit Chai
Examiner
Art Unit 2131

LBC

AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100